

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 10, 2003. Claims 22-39 are presented for examination, of which Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 are in independent form. Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 22-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,529,522 B1 (Ito et al.).

The aspect of the present invention set forth in independent Claim 22 is communication system that comprises a first apparatus, in a wireless network, a second apparatus, in a wired network, and a communication apparatus that is arranged to communicate with the first apparatus, and to communicate with the second apparatus. According to Claim 22, the communication apparatus includes a first communication unit, a decoding unit, an encoding unit, and a second communication unit. The first communication unit is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first encoding system and transmitted from the first apparatus, and the encoding unit is adapted to decode the first encoded video data into video data and to encode the video data into second encoded video data using a second encoding system. The second communication unit is adapted to transmit the second encoded video data to the second apparatus.

Accordingly, among other important features of the system recited in Claim 22, is that encoded video data, which has been encoded using a first manner of encoding, is received

from the first apparatus and is decoded by a decoding unit, the result is encoded by an encoding unit using a second manner of encoding, and the result is sent to the second apparatus.

*Ito* relates to a communication apparatus equipped with a digital interface, in which encoded image data (e.g., JPEG data) received through the wireless/wired interface is transmitted from the interface without being decoded. In the *Ito* arrangement, the signal format may be changed, but the data itself is not decoded, much less decoded and then re-encoded. Applicants submit that nothing in that patent would teach or suggest the recited communication unit that has a decoding unit and an encoding unit arranged and operating as recited in Claim 22, and submit that that claim is therefore allowable over *Ito*..

Independent Claim 31 is directed to a communication system that comprises a first apparatus in a wireless network, a second apparatus in a wired network, and a communication apparatus that is arranged to communicate with the first apparatus and with the second apparatus. The communication apparatus includes a first communication unit, a decoding unit, an encoding unit, and a second communication unit. The second communication unit is adapted to receive second encoded video data encoded by a second encoding system and transmitted from the second apparatus, the decoding unit is adapted to decode the second encoded video data into video data, the encoding unit is adapted to encode the video data into first encoded video data using a first encoding system, and the first communication unit is adapted to transmit the first encoded video data to the first apparatus.

Claim 31 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Ito* for the same reasons as is Claim 22.

Independent Claims 25 and 34 are directed to a communication apparatus having the features recited for the communication apparatus that forms part of the systems of Claim 22 and of Claim 31, respectively, and are therefore deemed to be allowable over *Ito* for the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claims 22.

Each of the other independent claims is a method claim corresponding either to Claim 22 or to Claim 31, and each is therefore believed to be clearly allowable over *Ito*.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29, 284

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 390185v1